digenously from the price control list at least for the first 5 years.

(iv) To exclude those life-saving drugs and pharmaceutical products whose availability is for more important than the price. As the nature of demand is such that it is required less frequently but its non-availability is fatal. The notable examples of such categories are sera and vaccines.

(v) Exclude those pharmaceutical products of drugs • where the domestic production structure is so competitive that there is little-possibility that the consumers will be overcharged compared to the cost of production.

(e) As per the provisions of DPCO, 1987, the referred formulations are price decontrolled and the concerned manufacturer is free to revise the prices.

Statement

Name of the formulation	Unit (Kgs.)	1984-85		1985-86		1986-87	
		Quantity	CIF value (Rs.)	Quantity	CIF value (Rs.)	Quantity	CIF value (Rs.)
Fluocinolone Acetonide	—	36	2570208	39	2892839	23	1557496

Notices to Drug Companies

45S9. DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA : Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleasod to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 3275 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 22nd August, 1988 and State :

(a) the names of the drug companies to which notices were sent from 1984 to 1987;

(b) the names of the drugs involved in each case ;

(o) what are the details of the follow-up action taken ;

(d) whether his Ministry finalised the amount due from any of tbe companies;

(e) if so. what are the details thereof ;

(f) whether it is a fact that his Department is deliberately not taking any Ection despite the powers available under the Essential Commodities Act;

(g) whether any investigation is being proposed to fix responsibility against those responsible for the non-recovery of public money which was overcharged from poor masses of the country; and

(h) if so, by wnen and if not, what are the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO): (a) and (b>

Information, to the extent available * is given in the Statement I and II *(See* below).

(d) and (e) Information, to the extent available, is given in the Statement III *(See* below).

(c) and (f) The determination of amounts and recovery of the same is a continuous process.

(g) No, Sir.

(h) Does not arise.

Statement—I

RIFAMPICIN"

J. Biochem Pharmaceuticals

2. Lyka Labs.

3. Astra IDPL Ltd

4. Micro Labs.

5. Themis Chemicals Ltd.

6. Alembic Chemicals Labs.

7. Bombay Drug House.

8. Pharmod Pvt. Ltd.

9. Dolphin Labs.

10. Albert David Ltd.

11. Pharmaceuticals & Chemicals lad.

12. Cadila Labs (P) Ltd.

13. Sarabhai Chemicals.

14. Lupin Labi.

15. Ranbaxy Labs.

16. Wallace Pharmaceuticals.

17. Ethico Drugs & Chem. Mfg. *Co.*

DIPHYRIDAMOL

1. M/s. German Remedies

GENTAMYCIN

1. M/s. Futford India Ltd. (Court Case)

2. M/s. Biochem Pharma Ltd.

3. M/s. Lyka Labs Ltd.

Statement- 11

Name of the Balk Drug

1 Rifampicm

2. Dexamethazonc

3. clofazamine

4. D /Xycycline

5. Metronidazole'

6. Arnpicillin

7. Gerttamycin

8. Dipyridamol

9. Salbutamol

10. Flucimolone

11. Naproxen

12. Chloroquine

13 Aspirin

14. Dapsonc

Statement—III

Details of tentative amounts assessed and recoverable under para 7(2) *of DPCO,* 1979

1	2	3
6.	Alembic Chemicals Labs	38,72,747.98
7.	Bombay Drug House	1,73,061.00
8.	Pharmed Pvt. Ltd.	68,00,776.80
9.	Dolphin Labs.	18,10,988.20
10.	Albert David Ltd.	3,91,419.00
11.	Pharmaceuticals & Chemicals Ind.	87,993,26.50
12.	Cadila Labs. Pvt. Ltd.	76,52,433.00
13.	Sarabhai Chemicals	4,13,986.48
14.	Lupin Labs.	2,15,89,000.00
15.	Ranbaxy Labs.	47,77.652.40
16.	Wallace Pharmaceuticals	2,82,071.00
17.	Ethico Drug & Chemical Mfg. *Co.*	1,40,97,889.00
	DIPHYRIDAMOL	
1.	M/s. Gertmn Remedies	59,95,039.00
	GBNTAMYCIN	
1.	M/s. Falford India Ltd. (Court Case)	194.62 Lakhs
2.	M/s. Biochem Pharma Ltd.	33.88 Lakhs
3.	M/s. Lyka Labs Ltd.	27.47 Lakhs

Recovery of DPEA arrears

4b9X DR. (SHRIMATI) NAJMA HEPTULLA : Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refei to the answer to Unstarred Question 3282 given in the Rajya Sibha on the 22nd August, 1988 and State :

(a) whether it is a fact that his Ministry has failed to recover the amount overcharged from the consumers by drug companies under DPEA;

(b) whether it is also a fact that lis Ministry has not been able to ob-ain information from the companies o whom notices were sent under the irovision of DPGO, 1979 despite the ict that full powers are available to vspect and collect information;

(c) whether it is also a fact that his linistry has not been able to work nt the estimated amount due from ie companies; and

(d) if so, what are the reasons therefor ?

j THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY | (SHRI J. VENGAL RAO) : <a) No, j Sir.

(b) to (d) Many of the companies did not furnish the required details. The amount for which notices issued for recovery have been disputed and representations made. However, the determination of amounts and recovery of the same is a continuous process and appropriate action as per due process of law would be taken.

4591. *[Withdrawn]*

Overcharging of prices on drugs

4592. SHRI DHARANIDHAR BASUMATARI : Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 330(8 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 22nd August, 1988 and state :